## Exhibit A

## Defendants' Correction of Plaintiffs' Exhibits C and E

**Regarding Over-Designation** 

## Defendants' Correction of Plaintiffs' Exhibits C and E Regarding Over-Designation

	Number of Pages of Documents Alleged by Plaintiffs to Have Been Produced from	Defendants' Correction
Date	Logs	
Feb. 18, 2005	2,824	22,825 pages produced
Apr. 26, 2005	1,810	<ul> <li>Only 121 pages containing redactions were logged and withheld as privileged</li> <li>More than 22,000 pages were produced on rolling basis</li> </ul>
Aug. 31, 2005	4,339	
Sep. 2, 2005	4,901	
Sep. 9, 2005	717	
Sep. 20, 2005	8,234	promptly after responsiveness review or after Court resolved dispute over responsive dates on Apr. 26, 2005
		Those 22,000+ pages were never designated as privileged on any log
Nov. 1, 2005	34	Only 97 pages
Nov. 4, 2005	28	Description of the designated hospital Special Master
Nov. 23, 2005	35	Documents de-designated because Special Master issued case-specific standards for work product designation (Oct. 31, 2005 Tr. 109-13)
Dec. 16, 2005	2,829	22,425 pages produced
Dec. 22, 2005	18,707	
Dec. 23, 2005	889	Documents de-designated in response to Special Master's Dec. 1, 2005 decision
		<ul> <li>Documents are double counted in part because they include re-production of previously redacted documents (i.e., where redactions appeared on part of a page), because of software constraints</li> </ul>
Jan. 8, 2006	1,902	3,461 pages (3,530 pages in plaintiffs' total is in error)
Jan. 11, 2006 Jan. 19, 2006	1,129 499	Documents were privileged on their face
Ball. 10, 2000		<ul> <li>Defendants subsequently learned that documents had been disclosed to third parties, especially outside auditors, and produced them</li> </ul>
		Documents are double counted in part because many documents are electronic copies of BCE's public securities filings that consist of a cover e-mail which was produced in December 2005 with entirely redacted attachments; once BCE realized that those documents were not privileged, the same number of pages was Bates stamped a second time
Feb. 21, 2006	7,123	7,123 pages produced
		<ul> <li>Documents are double counted in part because they include re-production of previously redacted documents (i.e., where redactions appeared on part of a page), because of software constraints</li> </ul>
TOTAL	56,000	In addition to comments above, plaintiffs' page count is also inflated because:

<ul> <li>Special Master required BCE to produce cover e-mails whose attachments were privileged</li> </ul>
<ul> <li>Since December 2005, BCE produced nearly 7,200 pages that are redacted in full (that is, privileged attachments to non-privileged cover e-mails)</li> </ul>
<ul> <li>Thus, nearly 13% of the pages plaintiffs include in their 56,000 total page count are blank</li> </ul>
<ul> <li>Many of the documents on the logs are identical copies, which were each logged for the sake of consistency</li> </ul>